

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DANIEL SLOCUM,

Petitioner,

Case No. 13-13787

Hon. Sean F. Cox

v.

JOE BARRETT,

Respondent.

---

OPINION & ORDER DENYING  
A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

This matter is before the Court on Petitioner's pro se motion for certificate of appealability (Docket #21).

On January 8, 2015, the Court entered an Opinion and Order denying Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus. Therein, the Court also denied Petitioner certificate of appealability and permission to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis. The Court stated:

Before Petitioner may appeal this Court's dispositive decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). A certificate of appealability may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When a court rejects a habeas claim on the merits, the substantial showing threshold is met if Petitioner demonstrates that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claim debatable or wrong. See *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000). "A petitioner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that . . . jurists could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003). In applying that standard, a district court may not conduct a full merits review, but must limit its examination to a threshold inquiry into the underlying merit of Petitioner's claims. *Id.* at 336-37. "The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant." Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, Rule 11(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254.

Petitioner has not demonstrated a substantial showing of the denial of a

constitutional right. Accordingly, a certificate of appealability is not warranted in this case. The Court further concludes that Petitioner should not be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal, as any appeal would be frivolous. See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a).

Petitioner's current motion is, in essence, a motion for reconsideration of the Court's conclusions in the January 8, 2015 Opinion and Order as it pertained to issuing a certificate of appealability. The Court finds that Petitioner has not: (1) presented the Court with "a palpable defect by which the Court and the parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled," and (2) "show[n] that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case." *See* E.D. Mich. L.R. 7.1(h)(3). In addition, the Court does not find any of the statements or arguments offered by Petitioner in the current motion warrant the issuance of a certificate of appealability.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, the Court DENIES Petitioner's motion for certificate of appealability (Docket #21).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 13, 2015

S/ Sean F. Cox

Sean F. Cox  
U. S. District Judge

I hereby certify that on April 13, 2015, the foregoing document was served on counsel of record via electronic means and upon Daniel Slocum via First Class mail at the address below:

DANIEL SLOCUM 685449  
COOPER STREET CORRECTIONAL FACILITY  
3100 COOPER STREET  
JACKSON, MI 49201

S/ J. McCoy  
Case Manager